1995, no per	U.S. Patent and Tra	PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 ademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE f information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.
TRANSMITTAL FORM  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		10/081,933
		February 21, 2002
		Bill N. Musharbash
		2123
		Guill, Russell L.
2	Attorney Docket Number	INTG-001
	ol filing)	U.S. Patent and Tr 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of  Application Number  Filing Date  First Named Inventor  Art Unit  Examiner Name

Total Number of Pages in This Submiss		Attorney Docket N	umber	INTG-001		· フ		
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)								
Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to TC				
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences				
Amendment / Reply	Petition					cation to TC ef, Reply Brief)		
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Proprietary Information				
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			Status Letter				
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer			Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):				
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary forms (2); return postcard				
☐ Information Disclosure Statement	☐ Landscape Table on CD			•				
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks							
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application								
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1.52 or 1.53								
SIG	NATURE OF A	APPLICANT, ATTOI	RNEY, OI	R AGENT				
Firm	THELEN REID	& PRIEST LLP						
Signature	Mmn	Kind						
Printed Name	Marc S. Hanish							
Date	March 28, 2006 Reg. No.			42,626				
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING								
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.								
Signature St	raron	& Kym						
Typed or printed name Sharon E	. Byam			Date	March 2	28, 2006		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



## Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: <u>10/081,933</u>	First Named Appli	cant: Bill N. Mush	<u>arbash</u>			
Examiner: Russell L. Guill	Art Unit: 2123	Status of Applica	tion: <u>Pend</u>	ing		
Participants: (1) Examiner Russell L. Guill (2) Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626						
(3)	(4)					
Date of Interview: March 24, 2006, 9:00 a.m., Pacific Standard Time						
Type of Interview: (a) [X] Telephonic	(b) [ ] Personal (c) [ ] Video Conferen			ıference		
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:	[] YES [X] NO	0				
If yes, provide brief description:_				•		
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	N/A		
(1) <u>21 &amp; 48</u> (2) <u> </u>		[] [] []	[X], [] []	[] [] []		
[] Continuation Sheet Attached	[] Copy of Draft Am	nendment (attached)	)			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:						
Spoke with Examiner regarding Examiner's Amendment to Claims 21 and 48. Agreed to add element "displaying an indication of whether the connection is valid". Examiner agreed that this would put claims in condition for allowance.						
Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record  A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.						
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)						
(Applicant/Applicant's Representation	ive Signature)	Attorney Doc	ket No. INTO	G-001 (033054-003)		



## Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: 10/081,933 First Named Applicant: Bill N. Musharbash							
xaminer: Russell L. Guill Art Unit: 2123 Status of Application: Pending							
Participants: (1) Examiner Russell L. Guill (2) Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626							
(3)(4)							
Date of Interview: March 27, 2006, 10:00 a.m., Pacific Standard Time							
Type of Interview: (a) [X] Telephonic							
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b>	[] YES [X] NO						
If yes, provide brief description:_							
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	N/A			
(1) 21, 23, 48, 50		[]	[X]	[]			
(3) <u>54 &amp; 56-59</u> (4)		[] []	[]	[]			
[] Continuation Sheet Attached [] Copy of Draft Amendment (attached)							
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:							
Agreed to Examiner's amendment, changing "endpoints" to "pieces of equipment" and "ones" to "connectors" in claims.							
Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record  A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.							
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)							
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)  Attorney Docket No. INTG-001 (033054-003)							